```
IBSPISSC
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                             17 CR 0074 (CM)
                 V.
5
      IBRAHIM ISSA, a/k/a "Tony
      Issa,"
6
                     Defendant.
 7
      -----X
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
9
                                              November 28, 2018
                                              10:20 a.m.
10
11
     Before:
12
                           HON. COLLEEN MCMAHON,
13
                                              Chief District Judge
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
16
      GEOFFREY S. BERMAN,
           United States Attorney for the
17
           Southern District of New York
      ELIZABETH HANFT
18
     NOAH SOLOWIEJCZYK
     KYLE WIRSHBA
19
          Assistant United States Attorneys
20
     BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
           Attorneys for Defendant
21
     BENJAMIN BRAFMAN
      JOSHUA KIRSHNER
22
      STUART GOLD
23
     ALSO PRESENT: SPECIAL AGENT ANTHONY DUBAR, USPS OIG
24
                    PRIYA KUURLALL, Paralegal with Mr. Brafman
25
```

(In open court)

(Case called)

MS. HANFT: Good morning, your Honor. Elizabeth
Hanft, Kyle Wirshba and Noah Solowiejczyk for the government,
and with us here at counsel table is Special Agent Anthony
Dubar from the United States Postal Service, Office of the
Inspector General.

THE COURT: Hi there.

MR. BRAFMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Benjamin Brafman, Josh Kirshner and also Stuart Gold, attorneys, and Priya Kuurlall, who is a paralegal who will be joining us at trial. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning. Okay. I've disposed of the outstanding motions. I have a letter from Mr. Brafman, which I barely had a chance to glance at. Let me start with the government. Any issues from the government that have to be disposed of before trial?

MS. HANFT: Aside from the letter from Mr. Brafman, your Honor, the only thing we wanted to put on the record was just that a formal plea offer in this case was extended in January of 2017. It was later withdrawn. Since then, the parties have engaged in plea negotiations informally as recently as a few weeks ago, but a formal plea offer has not been made. As defense counsel indicated, the defendant was not interested.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. HANFT: Other than that, your Honor, we only would like to address the defense counsel's letter.

THE COURT: Okay. Which I don't have a copy.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, very briefly. The defendant and counsel have extensively discussed the different plea offers and the defendant has maintained from the very beginning that he wants this trial, that he is not guilty, and we are proceeding to trial.

And I stipulate that the government has, in fact, extended plea offers. We've talked about them on different occasions, but as we speak, the defendant is determined to go to trial, and we are prepared to do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Issa has always taken that position.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, ma'am. Your Honor, very briefly. The only thing — I'm not going back to the Court's ruling on anything. I think we've preserved the record on that, and I appreciate the time your Honor has given us on that.

We have submitted a letter, and just briefly, Judge, the evidence in this case will show that both the undercover U.S. Postal Service cooperating witnesses and the defendant, at various times, discussed certain ethical prohibitions that are in the defendant's contract and are also known to the Postal Service officers.

In words and substance, they are not permitted to take

anything from someone who does business with the Post Office, and if a vendor offers something, then the contract provides that the contract is voidable and the Postal Service person could lose his or her job or be brought up on ethical charges.

It is nothing — it has nothing to do with the crime charged, in that you could violate the terms of your agreement by offering a cup of coffee to someone who you're doing business with, and it doesn't rise to the level of bribery because it doesn't have the elements that I think your Honor will ultimately charge this jury.

We don't want the jury to be confused about this issue for the weeks of the trial; so we're asking the Court to simply, when you have your preliminary instructions, include just a brief statement about that. It's a correct statement of the law, and it's something that both parties are going to be discussing, I think, at various times — certainly the defense will at various times during the trial. And I think the jury should —

THE COURT: I hear you.

MR. BRAFMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: I've always wanted to give a charge at the beginning of the case, but that means giving the charge. That doesn't mean give a little excerpt of the charge. It means give the charge.

MR. BRAFMAN: But if they were -- in the case where,

like this, for example, where there is going to be some --

IBSPISSC

THE COURT: I won't give part of the charge. I will not give part. I'm happy to give the entire bribery charge upfront. You'll hear me say several of the counts will involve this. I'm going to charge you on this at the beginning and at the end, unless the government has some overwhelming objection. But then I'll get to work on the charge, like I have nothing better to do for the rest of this week. But I will not give a little, one-paragraph preces. I will give charge.

MR. BRAFMAN: But I --

THE COURT: They will hear all of the elements.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. In the alternative, what we would then be asking, and it doesn't have to be done now, is when these issues arise in the course of the testimony, we would be asking for a curative instruction, just explaining to the jury that the issue of ethics is not what they are on trial for.

THE COURT: Well, they will certainly be charged at some point that ethics, ethical violations are not what they're on trial for; that he's on trial for violations of certain statutes that have certain elements, each of which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt to the satisfaction of 12 jurors.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand that, and I'm not going to belabor the issue. I just want the Court to think about the

following. If they hear evidence that my client gives something of value to a government witness, they may conclude that that is what the charged crime is, and you will ultimately explain the charge of bribery. But if I give a Postal Service person a cup of coffee, I may lose my contract because it says you can't do that, but that is not, by itself, a crime, we submit, even if it violates the rules of the Postal Service, and I think --

THE COURT: Sounds like your closing argument.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, Judge, but --

THE COURT: I'm not going to deliver your closing argument.

MR. BRAFMAN: I'm not asking you --

THE COURT: You'll do a much better job than I will.

MR. BRAFMAN: I'm not willing to debate that, and I certainly don't want to give a closing argument, but I think from time to time, your Honor, we ask for curative instructions in a trial when something prejudicial is involved.

THE COURT: If I think something needs to be cured, I give a curative instruction. I've never failed to give a curative instruction, in 23 years of doing this, when I thought something happened that needed to be cured.

MR. BRAFMAN: So I assume that if I were to say, in words or substance, in my opening statement: You need to wait until you hear the Court's instructions at the end of the

trial, but I submit, respectfully, that if I give you a cup of coffee, by itself I may violate the rules of my contract, but it doesn't necessarily mean that I've committed the crime until you hear the instruction.

THE COURT: And then I will say to the jurors: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you have just heard Mr. Brafman make what is, in essence, a legal argument. I will tell you what the law is at the end of the case, and you will follow my instructions of law because you have just promised to do that.

I've done it before, and I'll do it again. That's a curative instruction.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's why I wanted to front this issue.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAFMAN: So that doesn't happen. Thank you, your Honor. I have nothing further, other than --

THE COURT: Okay, great.

MR. BRAFMAN: I assume we're going to go over the schedule that the Court --

THE COURT: Ahh, yes, the schedule. Okay. I now remember why I wanted this trial to start this week and not next week. It's because Chief Judge McMahon's duties during the month of December exceed even her duties during all other months. So can I get a really solid estimate from the government of how long you think your case is going to take?

MS. HANFT: Yes, your Honor. We still think that two

weeks is a conservative estimate. We think it's possible -
THE COURT: Conservative? You're crazy. You're not
going to have seven days to put in testimony. You're just not
going to do it.

MS. HANFT: Again, your Honor, conservatively. We have discussed several stipulations with defense counsel. We think that if we are able to agree to them, we will likely rest in fewer days.

THE COURT: How many witnesses are you calling?

MS. HANFT: Approximately 12, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's a four-day trial. In my courtroom, that is a four-day trial.

MS. HANFT: There are several recordings, and we are also --

THE COURT: That's a four-day trial, trust me. We move in this courtroom.

MS. HANFT: Okay. Your Honor --

THE COURT: We will have, unfortunately, more interruptions than usual, particularly on Monday, the 10th, but we will be picking a jury on Monday. I'm going to tell them it's a two-week trial and that they'll be home in plenty of time for the holidays.

The minute the jury is picked, should it be picked before the end of the day, I will give instructions and you will be ready to open. Everybody has to have their witnesses

here. If you don't have a witness here and it's before 4:30, the next words out of your mouth had better be "I rest."

MR. BRAFMAN: Judge?

THE COURT: And we don't sit on Fridays.

MR. BRAFMAN: What? I'm sorry?

THE COURT: We don't sit on Fridays, and we won't be sitting Friday the 7th. By the 14th, they should be deliberating, if not done.

Mr. Brafman, you, of course, have no obligation to tell me anything, but do you anticipate that you might be putting on a case?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, and it will be brief. And I also tell you that we are working diligently with the government to stipulate to as many things as possible --

THE COURT: I'm sure that that's true.

MR. BRAFMAN: -- to shorten the trial.

THE COURT: I have never had it happen otherwise with thoroughly professional counsel.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So I pick a jury using the struck method, which I think is fairest to the parties, fairest to counsel because you always know who your next juror is after you make a strike. So that means we will get a panel of -- I'm not going to have 80 jurors. I'm not going to do 80 jurors for a two-week trial with two alternates. No need to have 80

jurors. You can have 80 people in the room, if you want, but we will start with a group of about 50. 18, 20 of whom will be in the box, 30 of whom will be on the left side back here, and we will examine that group of jurors.

Hopefully, we will not -- I mean, it's holiday season; so a lot of people will, undoubtedly, try to get out of jury service and, hopefully, we'll not have to deal with a lot of those, but things go pretty quickly once we get past that prescreening.

So that will start on Monday. I haven't done the voir dire yet. Thank you for your suggestions. And then pretty much, we go. Let's look at my ridiculous calendar. What? I can't get CEO on this computer. It says the publisher cannot be verified. CEO is our internal calendar. Excuse me while I go down to Mr. O'Neil's.

Okay. I'll have a lunch meeting on Tuesday, but that shouldn't take more than a total of an hour and a half. This is off. Same is true on Wednesday. An hour on Thursday. We're great next week. We don't have serious problems. My worst day for interruptions is Monday, the 10th, but we'll be well into things by then. Oh, Wednesday, the 12th, I have a Second Circuit Judicial Council meeting. That was the other thing why I didn't want to be on trial. That's a mandatory, I have to be, from 12:00 to as long as it takes. I hope it won't take more than a couple of hours, at the Second Circuit

Judicial Council meeting. So we'll have a long lunch hour that day.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, excuse me. Does that mean that 12-10 we will not be sitting?

THE COURT: No, no, no. It just means we will have an unusually long lunch hour. It means we will be quitting early because I have to attend the opening of Judge Katzmann's Justice For All Center on the fifth floor of the old courthouse. You may have read about it in the newspaper over the weekend.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. I was talking about Monday, the 10th.

THE COURT: Monday the 10th, that's what I'm talking about.

MR. BRAFMAN: So we will not be sitting Monday?

THE COURT: We will be sitting.

MR. BRAFMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: We will be much interrupted. We will be sitting, and we will be interrupted on Wednesday, the 12th because of the Second Circuit Judicial Council. That will be a long lunch hour.

If the jury is deliberating by the 14th, we will be around on Friday, and I'm not going anywhere. Okay? All right. I'm trying to keep these things to a minimum, but it's literally something comes in every day.

Okay. So make sure that Mr. O'Neil has a complete list of names and locations that we should apprise the jurors of. Make sure we have a complete list of everybody who's going to be at your table so we can introduce you properly, and beyond that, I think we're ready to go.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MS. HANFT: One final item, your Honor. In light of the Court's ruling today, I assume the Court has no objection to our filing our submissions on the docket now, our submission in support of the crimes fraud motion?

THE COURT: Yes, that's correct.

MS. HANFT: Thank you okay.

THE COURT: Indeed, in the event there is no objection, you must.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, in light of the Court's ruling, and without waiving our position, I assume that we could still examine Mr. Tsamutulis about how he came to be retained, who retained him and the fact that he was retained under a confidentiality agreement even if the Court views it as no longer a privilege.

THE COURT: You can certainly ask those kinds of questions, and the jury will consider them for whatever relevance they have, which may be some and maybe none.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, ma'am. And one final ask. When your Honor reviews the government's submission with respect to

25

voir dire, we're generally in agreement. We just ask the 1 2 Court, respectfully, given the nature of the charges, that when 3 you are questioning prospective jurors, the only thing we would ask you to focus on more than normal would be whether any 4 5 member of their family is employed by the United States Postal Service, has been employed, and I assume your Honor recognizes 6 7 that. 8 THE COURT: It is already there. That part is already 9 there. 10 MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I'll see you Monday. Great. 12 MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Fabulous. MS. HANFT: Thank you, your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you, all. 16 (Adjourned) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24